

---

**Sl.No. Name of the State, Growth Centre/District**

---

16. **Nanded (Nanded)**
17. **PUNJAB**  
**Batinda (Batinda)**
18. **Pathankot (Gurdaspur)**
19. **RAJASTHAN**  
**Abu-Road (Sirohi)**
20. **Khara (Bikaner)**
21. **Dholpur (Dholpur)**
22. **Jhalawar (Jhalawar)**
23. **TAMIL NADU**  
**Erode (Periyar)**
24. **TRIPURA**  
**Bodhjung Nagar (West Tripura)**
25. **UTTAR PRADESH**  
**Bijauli (Jhansi)**
26. **Satharia (Jaunpur)**
27. **Shajanwa (Gorakhpur)**

---

**FDI in backward districts**

**579. PROF. M. M. AGARWAL:** Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government have taken some effective measures to promote foreign direct investment in the backward districts of the country since the liberalization policy is adopted;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the details of total investment made by several companies in the backward districts of the country during the last three years, year-wise; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (DR. RAMAN): (a) and (b) With a view to attracting more foreign investment into the country, Government has already put in place a transparent, dynamic and investment friendly FDI policy placing almost all activities under the automatic route for FDI upto 100% except a small list. The selection of the location by the foreign investors/joint venture Indian partners depends upon their commercial judgement, the level of infrastructure and others commercial benefits available in the locality.

(c) and (d) The state-wise, breakup of the FDI approved during the last three years is given in the Statement enclosed. District-wise FDI data are not maintained.

**Statement**

*State-wise breakup of Foreign Direct investment approved during the period 01/01/1998 to 31/12/2000*

(Amount in Rs. Crore)

States	Amount of FDI approved		
	1998	1999	2000
Andhra Pradesh	2336.80	781.40	3415.67
Assam	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bihar	44.65	603.70	20.50
Gujarat	3348.71	1115.15	95.96
Haryana	225.37	731.47	52.64
Himachal Pradesh	0.33	16.15	1.35
Jammu and Kashmir	0.00	0.40	0.00
Karnataka	5026.85	2513.28	4101.18
Kerala	58.52	210.25	484.25
Madhya Pradesh	660.18	1851.09	265.27
Maharashtra	3063.05	6251.98	13282.37
Meghalaya	44.46	0.00	0.00
Orissa	330.54	223.64	0.05
Punjab	101.59	19.44	25.30
Rajasthan	65.14	194.88	149.93

(Amount in Rs. Crore)

States	Amount of FDI approved		
	1998	1999	2000
Tamil Nadu	3081.17	1647.35	4880.99
Tripura	0.00	0.00	0.00
Uttar Pradesh	247.21	672.17	433.85
West Bengal	1205.40	308.88	701.20
Andaman & Nicobar	12.80	0.00	0.00
Chandigarh	65.48	2.03	3.05
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	8.22	35.92	0.00
Delhi	1091.08	6635.37	1966.95
Goa	114.62	33.84	28.20
Mizoram	0.00	0.00	1.52
Pondicherry	38.91	39.89	1.42
Daman & Diu	5.85	22.29	3.00
State not Indicated	9636.57	4455.98	7124.78
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>30813.50</b>	<b>28366.53</b>	<b>37039.45</b>

**Submission of case on Subsidies at WTO**

580. SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether keeping best interest in view, a think tank has suggested that India should present a 'livelihood box' at WTO and demand subsidies could be done away with but items such as food, housing, education and water could be above ban;

(b) if so, whether India has prepared a case for placing it before WTO; and

(c) if so, the latest position in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): (a) As reported in some sections of the press, suggestions have been made for creation of a 'livelihood box' under the Agreement on Agriculture during the ongoing mandated negotiation on agriculture in WTO.

(b) and (c) India in its negotiating proposals submitted to the WTO for the ongoing negotiations under the Agreement on Agriculture, has emphasised that for large agrarian developing countries like